

REMARKS

Reconsideration is requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Claims 1 and 3 have been revised. Support for the revisions in claim 1 can be found at, e.g., page 14, line 26 to page 15, line 1, page 16, lines 23-28 of the specification, and Figs. 14-17 and 18A, 18B, among other places. Support for revisions in claim 3 can be found in, e.g., paragraph bridging pages 17 and 18 of the specification and Figs. 18A and 18B, among other places. Claims 2 and 5 have been editorially revised. The specification has been editorially revised. Claims 1-7 remain pending in the application.

Priority

Applicants respectfully submit that there is no requirement to add the specific reference to the prior-filed Japanese application to the specification in this case, since the foreign priority claim is not made under 35 USC 119(e), which relates to US provisional applications. The Japanese application was listed on the application data sheet.

Information Disclosure Statement

Applicants respectfully submit that an English language Abstract was provided for JP 62-110580, JP 2003-146263 and JP 2001-518858, which were listed in 1449 Forms submitted on April 22, 2005 and August 16, 2007 respectively, at the time the 1449 Forms were submitted.

With respect to the Information Disclosure Statement filed on August 16, 2007, only the Japanese Office Action from the corresponding JP 2004-546418 listed on the Form 1449 has not been translated into English by the Applicants. This is not a reference per se, and was provided only for the Examiner's convenience. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned if there are specific questions about this document.

Applicants note that the 1449 Form submitted with the Information Disclosure Statement filed December 5, 2007 was not returned with the current Office Action. Confirmation of consideration for the reference cited in the Form 1449 submitted on December 5, 2007 is respectfully requested.

Objections to the Drawings

The drawings are objected to because reference characters "56" and "58" have both been used to designate stopper. Editorial revisions have been made to the specification to designate the structure referred to by reference character "58" as stopper lever. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Editorial revisions have been made in claims 1-3 and 5 to address the Examiner's concern. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Motomi et al. (WO 03/039941 A1; US Publication No. 2005/0017057 used for US equivalency). Applicants note that the effective prior art date of the Motomi et al. reference is May 15, 2003, which is the publication date of the Japanese language PCT application. The present application, however, claims priority under 35 U.S.C. 119 to Japanese Application No. 2002-307059, filed October 22, 2002. Accordingly, applicants submit herewith a verified translation of the application to prefect the claim to priority. Motomi et al. are not available as prior art and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 USC § 102(a) and (e) as being anticipated by McNamara et al. (US 6,595,407). Applicants respectively traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 requires a joisted-locating jig that can be conveyed 1) from a first stock area to a pair of frames at sides of a transfer line to attach the jig to the frames for locating side members and a bridging part of a car body and 2) from the frames to a second stock area for replacement with other joisted-locating jigs which are also conveyed from the first stock area to the frames. This one-way transfer of jigs allows removal of a used jig to the second stock area to be performed substantially simultaneously with transferring a new jig from the first stock area and thus effectively

helps increase the efficiency of the work (see page 16, lines 23-28 of the specification and Figs. 17, 18A and 18B, among other places).

McNamara et al. fail to disclose the joisted-locating jig that can be conveyed 1) from a first stock area to a pair of frames at sides of a transfer line to attach the jig to the frames for locating side members and a bridging part of a car body and 2) from the frames to a second stock area for replacement with other joisted-locating jigs which are also conveyed from the first stock area to the frames, as required by claim 1. Instead, McNamara et al. discuss a pair of framing gates 20 movable between a framing position in Fig. 1, a pre-transport position in Fig. 2 and a stowed position in Fig. 3 (see McNamara et al., Figs. 1-3 and col. 5, lines 46-60). McNamara et al. are completely silent as to a jig that is conveyed from a first stock area to frames and then from the frames to a second stock area as required by claim 1.

For at least these reasons, claim 1 is patentable over McNamara et al. Claim 2 depends from claim 1 and is patentable along with claim 1 and need not be separately distinguished at this time. Applicants are not conceding the relevance of the rejection to the remaining features of the rejected claims.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 3-5 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over McNamara et al. in view of Kozai (Japanese Publication No. JP62-110580A) and Wood et al. (US No. 5,972,112). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claims 3-5 depend ultimately from claim 1 and are patentable over McNamara et al., Kozai and Wood et al. for at least the same reasons discussed above regarding claims 1 and 2. Kozai and Wood et al. do not remedy the deficiencies of McNamara et al. Applicants are not conceding the relevance of the rejection to the remaining features of the rejected claims.

Claims 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over McNamara et al. in view of Kozai, Wood et al. and Japanese Publication No. JP53-151007U. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claims 6 and 7 depend

ultimately from claim 3 and are patentable over McNamara et al., Kozai, Wood et al. and JP53-151007 for at least the same reasons discussed above regarding claims 3-5. JP53-151007 does not remedy the deficiencies of McNamara et al., Kozai and Wood et al. Applicants are not conceding the relevance of the rejection to the remaining features of the rejected claims.

In view of the above, favorable reconsideration in the form of a notice of allowance is respectfully requested. Any questions regarding this communication can be directed to the undersigned attorney, Douglas P. Mueller, Reg. No. 30,300, at (612) 455-3804.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMRE, SCHUMANN, MUELLER &
LARSON, P.C.
P.O. Box 2902-0902
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0902
(612) 455-3800

Dated: October 30, 2008
By: 
Douglas P. Mueller
Reg. No. 30,300

DPM/cy